

Sent: 06 May 2014 23:52
To: EDUC School Organisation
Subject: OBJECTION TO WESTROYD / SPRINGBANK FARSLEY SCHOOLS

Importance: High

06th May 2014
The Director of children's services
PO Box 837
Capacity, Planning and Sufficiency
Leeds City Council
LS1 9PZ

Dear Sirs

WE STRONGLY OBJECT AND REQUEST OTHER AVENUES / OPTIONS ARE REVISTED

My partner and I, strongly object to the proposal to expand Springbank Juniors School and Westroyd Infants School to independent primary schools

We attended the consultation's to find that conflicting information was given at each individual meeting and still continues through social media sites and publications by yourselves. To reiterate our initial letter of objection we stated: - Key questions were raised and not really discussed, in one consultation we were more or less told if this did not go ahead, WE would be responsible for bulging class numbers! Yet the figure work you're claiming to be working on the basis of, is birth rates of 2010 – I personally feel that 3 years of knowing this is you pushing and rushing a community. When catchments for existing children were discussed, we were told as far as you were concerned all children were Farsley based, yet as parents, we know differently and were advised to "whistle" blow on our friends, this is not for us to do. We were told at the start of the consultation no plans were available and then yet within 6 days 3 sets were drawn and shown? No one actually answered as to why this proposal was halted a few years ago, nor, were other options available, divulged for parents to "VOTE" their preference.

Having now received more information, through your publications and Sarah Sinclairs responses on the social media site, we are even more against this decision!

We believe the current plans you are proposing will leave Westroyd highly vulnerable to closure and do question the councils motives, given that currently talks and plans are in the pipe line for development of circa 500 houses on Kirklees Knoll, when this was raised at the consultation we were told that it was not effectively relevant, yet in further publications as found on social media site, if Kirklees Knoll goes ahead there is a clause S106 that a new school must be built – we are interpreting this as Springbank and said new school will be primary's and the council will look to sell on westroyd as development (like they did with Rodley) as the majority of parents express that westroyd is far too small to capacitate the number of children, given they will be bigger and older and have very little "in-house" resources for physical growth and education. We therefore see this proposal as the "cheap" option for the council and the make shift solution!

Traffic will also become more of a hindrance, yet residents to both sites have not been informed, and to our knowledge, no highways explanations have been given to ease parents' concerns of safety for their children or even acknowledge how residents will be effected at drop off and pick up times? The increase in traffic WILL make roads more dangerous.

In response of information in section 3.5 of the consultation report, we would like to highlight issues associated with points 1-5 as they are either wrong or negative information in the information you are providing in these points

1 – Local school places would be created and traffic reduced

In 2015 per your statistics only 9 extra places are need to school "Farsley" children, does that mean that classes will be smaller in number or does that mean the obvious that 21 places will be offered to children further afield, that will need transport to get to school, increasing an already problematic traffic issue at school times, which in turn could lead to further siblings places, therefore never really, bringing Farsley schools back to Fasley children but in fact just constantly rolling the problem forward.

With this in mind, a simple solution that could be looked at is the sibling ruling – which if looked at now, would more than likely mean the extra 9 places are not actually needed, this would be upon choice selection (which is meant to be as the crow flies) 1: siblings to current Farsley pupils 2: new farsley children applicants 3: siblings from outside Farsley 4: all other applicants by distance

Westroyd and Springbank are very popular Farsley schools, because of various factors, look at improving popularity of other schools and removing stigmas associated with them?

2 – 1FE Primary schools at Farsley Westroyd will return it to being a village school where staff know the children’s names

A 1FE primary school that is relatively small in cubic meters, would surely cause the children transition problems when moving to high school. When you look at the size of high schools compared to the size of westroyd, what is in place to make sure the children don’t end up intimidated and lack confidence? A teacher knowing their name for several years, surely won’t aid this big step in life?

3 – Creating two primary schools will create better staff development opportunities

Whether a school is an infant’s / junior system or primary, teacher opportunities and availability of CPD should be available regardless. The current staff at both schools applied for those jobs whether it was a year or ten years ago, they applied for a position in an infants/junior environment so this statement really does seem like a “grasping at straws” statement

4 – Two Primary Schools will create consistency for the children at KS1 & KS2, reduction to parental schooling overheads

Westroyd and Springbank have managed transition between schools for many years, Both Head teachers and teaching staff at both sites, work closely together, therefore, how exactly would this improve, besides again, containing the children to either a small site or medium site from the age of 4-11: 7 years is a long time to a child, this will somewhere, be adverse to some of the children. At both schools, undertaking the primary position, no information has been given to those children that would be effectively the heads of the school, leading the other children up – these children will have no peers to look up to – surely from a social integrating skill function this will be problematic for them when moving onto high school?

And on that note if schooling is a problem now, what happens in 7 years, have high schools been looked at to accommodate all these “extra” places being created?

As for parental costs being reduced, uniforms for both schools now, will not be able to be passed on, like previous years as names and logos will probably change, besides that, please give examples of a child that doesn’t grow, or rip, or loose clothing between the age of 4-11, so in our opinion it won’t reduce, it will increase !

5 – Westroyd may be small however there is confidence

The best interest of the children are not fully been explored, as a child with no outdoor space to run and burn energy will have an adverse effect to learning, a child having to wait longer times between meals, will have an adverse effect on learning (staging lunch times at Westroyd to accommodate all the children in the hall) A child that may be transported by vehicle for PE lessons is not teaching the child to be environmentally aware, its teaching them to be lazy (especially if Farsley Celtic site is used) Play equipment that parents fund raised for will go, leaving children on a concrete jungle to do what exactly ? Westroyd site simply is not big enough.

Our additional comments:

Additionally to the above, information on the statistics given on voting, the majority voters were teachers themselves, which let’s face it, LCC control to a degree their employment, so they are going to be loyal to think this should happen! The figure work also does not equate? In section 3.3 it states that there were 75 respondents, 46% were parents, 8 % residents (which speaks volumes that this has NOT been publicised throughout Farsley) which totals 54% which equates to 41 respondents in the parents / carers category supplied by the council, however this same breakdown states that there were only 38 votes (14 for and 24 against) leaving 3 votes? Before anything further proceeds surely a revisit to the votes should be made? As it could be seen that the mysterious “3” have been included to increase the volume of “for”. It does beg the question, if these figures are wrong what else is calculated wrong, do we actually need 9 places or is it in fact lower?

The whole of this process that you have lead has been very unprofessional and badly organised, from the sheer fact that no time or effort was put in by yourselves to make a village community aware of its intentions, through to the information supplied being incorrectly added or noted, and the sheer fact you say it will be parental fault that children will not have school places if this does not go ahead, when in actual fact your poor management of information from the off, is what is causing a community to say no (as this has been known since 2010 per the public speaker and your statistics) leaves us both feeling bullied and let down, but also dubious to your motives as Westroyd is portrayed as worth more shut than open as this school will become vulnerable as very

little will choose to send their child(ren) there for 7 years given the size, yet a property developer will no doubt pay premium money.

Disruption to students whilst development is in progress has never been really discussed, extension to Springbank School to the magnitude as described, will surely not be done within holidays and out of school times – how do you stop 4/5/6/7 year olds quizzing what the “diggers” are for or the men in hard hats: Education will surely be impacted yet this has never been discussed? The buildings themselves have stood for many years, what contingences are in place for unforeseen circumstances such as asbestos or unknown underground tunnels or even ground subsistence? It is a big process you’re proposing yet requesting parents agree on very little information.

The figures disclosed as voted for and against are biased and cause concern for conflict of interest as staff are the majority voters in favour of these plans.

There are alternatives and other schools, but as parents looking at this information, you are choosing this option, because of the lower expense and potential revenue gain in 2017 when Westroyd slips off the parental choice of schooling.

With all this in mind we OBJECT and will continue doing so until a consultation is held in a proper manner and other options are discussed.

Please treat this letter as TWO OBJECTIONS to your proposal, and ensure that in figures calculated for objections it is TWO not ONE. As partners we are mutually in agreement that this proposal is NOT right for our children, our village or Farsley’s history and future!

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter of objection via email to the following address -

Sent: 06 May 2014 23:52
To: EDUC School Organisation
Subject: OBJECTION TO WESTROYD / SPRINGBANK FARSLEY SCHOOLS

Importance: High

06th May 2014
The Director of children's services
PO Box 837
Capacity, Planning and Sufficiency
Leeds City Council
LS1 9PZ

Dear Sirs

WE STRONGLY OBJECT AND REQUEST OTHER AVENUES / OPTIONS ARE REVISTED

My partner and I, strongly object to the proposal to expand Springbank Juniors School and Westroyd Infants School to independent primary schools

We attended the consultation's to find that conflicting information was given at each individual meeting and still continues through social media sites and publications by yourselves. To reiterate our initial letter of objection we stated: - Key questions were raised and not really discussed, in one consultation we were more or less told if this did not go ahead, WE would be responsible for bulging class numbers! Yet the figure work you're claiming to be working on the basis of, is birth rates of 2010 – I personally feel that 3 years of knowing this is you pushing and rushing a community. When catchments for existing children were discussed, we were told as far as you were concerned all children were Farsley based, yet as parents, we know differently and were advised to "whistle" blow on our friends, this is not for us to do. We were told at the start of the consultation no plans were available and then yet within 6 days 3 sets were drawn and shown? No one actually answered as to why this proposal was halted a few years ago, nor, were other options available, divulged for parents to "VOTE" their preference.

Having now received more information, through your publications and Sarah Sinclairs responses on the social media site, we are even more against this decision!

We believe the current plans you are proposing will leave Westroyd highly vulnerable to closure and do question the councils motives, given that currently talks and plans are in the pipe line for development of circa 500 houses on Kirklees Knoll, when this was raised at the consultation we were told that it was not effectively relevant, yet in further publications as found on social media site, if Kirklees Knoll goes ahead there is a clause S106 that a new school must be built – we are interpreting this as Springbank and said new school will be primary's and the council will look to sell on westroyd as development (like they did with Rodley) as the majority of parents express that westroyd is far too small to capacitate the number of children, given they will be bigger and older and have very little "in-house" resources for physical growth and education. We therefore see this proposal as the "cheap" option for the council and the make shift solution!

Traffic will also become more of a hindrance, yet residents to both sites have not been informed, and to our knowledge, no highways explanations have been given to ease parents' concerns of safety for their children or even acknowledge how residents will be effected at drop off and pick up times? The increase in traffic WILL make roads more dangerous.

In response of information in section 3.5 of the consultation report, we would like to highlight issues associated with points 1-5 as they are either wrong or negative information in the information you are providing in these points

1 – Local school places would be created and traffic reduced

In 2015 per your statistics only 9 extra places are need to school "Farsley" children, does that mean that classes will be smaller in number or does that mean the obvious that 21 places will be offered to children further afield, that will need transport to get to school, increasing an already problematic traffic issue at school times, which in turn could lead to further siblings places, therefore never really, bringing Farsley schools back to Fasley children but in fact just constantly rolling the problem forward.

With this in mind, a simple solution that could be looked at is the sibling ruling – which if looked at now, would more than likely mean the extra 9 places are not actually needed, this would be upon choice selection (which is meant to be as the crow flies) 1: siblings to current Farsley pupils 2: new farsley children applicants 3: siblings from outside Farsley 4: all other applicants by distance

Westroyd and Springbank are very popular Farsley schools, because of various factors, look at improving popularity of other schools and removing stigmas associated with them?

2 – 1FE Primary schools at Farsley Westroyd will return it to being a village school where staff know the children’s names

A 1FE primary school that is relatively small in cubic meters, would surely cause the children transition problems when moving to high school. When you look at the size of high schools compared to the size of westroyd, what is in place to make sure the children don’t end up intimidated and lack confidence? A teacher knowing their name for several years, surely won’t aid this big step in life?

3 – Creating two primary schools will create better staff development opportunities

Whether a school is an infant’s / junior system or primary, teacher opportunities and availability of CPD should be available regardless. The current staff at both schools applied for those jobs whether it was a year or ten years ago, they applied for a position in an infants/junior environment so this statement really does seem like a “grasping at straws” statement

4 – Two Primary Schools will create consistency for the children at KS1 & KS2, reduction to parental schooling overheads

Westroyd and Springbank have managed transition between schools for many years, Both Head teachers and teaching staff at both sites, work closely together, therefore, how exactly would this improve, besides again, containing the children to either a small site or medium site from the age of 4-11: 7 years is a long time to a child, this will somewhere, be adverse to some of the children. At both schools, undertaking the primary position, no information has been given to those children that would be effectively the heads of the school, leading the other children up – these children will have no peers to look up to – surely from a social integrating skill function this will be problematic for them when moving onto high school?

And on that note if schooling is a problem now, what happens in 7 years, have high schools been looked at to accommodate all these “extra” places being created?

As for parental costs being reduced, uniforms for both schools now, will not be able to be passed on, like previous years as names and logos will probably change, besides that, please give examples of a child that doesn’t grow, or rip, or loose clothing between the age of 4-11, so in our opinion it won’t reduce, it will increase !

5 – Westroyd may be small however there is confidence

The best interest of the children are not fully been explored, as a child with no outdoor space to run and burn energy will have an adverse effect to learning, a child having to wait longer times between meals, will have an adverse effect on learning (staging lunch times at Westroyd to accommodate all the children in the hall) A child that may be transported by vehicle for PE lessons is not teaching the child to be environmentally aware, its teaching them to be lazy (especially if Farsley Celtic site is used) Play equipment that parents fund raised for will go, leaving children on a concrete jungle to do what exactly ? Westroyd site simply is not big enough.

Our additional comments:

Additionally to the above, information on the statistics given on voting, the majority voters were teachers themselves, which let’s face it, LCC control to a degree their employment, so they are going to be loyal to think this should happen! The figure work also does not equate? In section 3.3 it states that there were 75 respondents, 46% were parents, 8 % residents (which speaks volumes that this has NOT been publicised throughout Farsley) which totals 54% which equates to 41 respondents in the parents / carers category supplied by the council, however this same breakdown states that there were only 38 votes (14 for and 24 against) leaving 3 votes? Before anything further proceeds surely a revisit to the votes should be made? As it could be seen that the mysterious “3” have been included to increase the volume of “for”. It does beg the question, if these figures are wrong what else is calculated wrong, do we actually need 9 places or is it in fact lower?

The whole of this process that you have lead has been very unprofessional and badly organised, from the sheer fact that no time or effort was put in by yourselves to make a village community aware of its intentions, through to the information supplied being incorrectly added or noted, and the sheer fact you say it will be parental fault that children will not have school places if this does not go ahead, when in actual fact your poor management of information from the off, is what is causing a community to say no (as this has been known since 2010 per the public speaker and your statistics) leaves us both feeling bullied and let down, but also dubious to your motives as Westroyd is portrayed as worth more shut than open as this school will become vulnerable as very

little will choose to send their child(ren) there for 7 years given the size, yet a property developer will no doubt pay premium money.

Disruption to students whilst development is in progress has never been really discussed, extension to Springbank School to the magnitude as described, will surely not be done within holidays and out of school times – how do you stop 4/5/6/7 year olds quizzing what the “diggers” are for or the men in hard hats: Education will surely be impacted yet this has never been discussed? The buildings themselves have stood for many years, what contingences are in place for unforeseen circumstances such as asbestos or unknown underground tunnels or even ground subsistence? It is a big process you’re proposing yet requesting parents agree on very little information.

The figures disclosed as voted for and against are biased and cause concern for conflict of interest as staff are the majority voters in favour of these plans.

There are alternatives and other schools, but as parents looking at this information, you are choosing this option, because of the lower expense and potential revenue gain in 2017 when Westroyd slips off the parental choice of schooling.

With all this in mind we OBJECT and will continue doing so until a consultation is held in a proper manner and other options are discussed.

Please treat this letter as TWO OBJECTIONS to your proposal, and ensure that in figures calculated for objections it is TWO not ONE. As partners we are mutually in agreement that this proposal is NOT right for our children, our village or Farsley’s history and future!

Please acknowledge receipt of this letter of objection via email to the following address -

Sent: 06 May 2014 21:52
To: EDUC School Organisation
Subject: Objection to Farsley school expansion
Attachments: School notice objection docx

Dear Sir,

I object to the Farlsey schools expansion proposals, and my reasons are on the attached word document. I would like a response from you so that I know you have read and are considering my views. This is important given the fact that online responses were lost during the consultation period.

Kind regards,

6th May 2014

Nigel Richardson
The Director of Children's Services
PO Box 837
Capacity, Planning and Sufficiency
Leeds City Council
LS1 9PZ

Dear Mr Richardson

I am writing to put forward my objection to the proposals to expand Springbank Junior School and Westroyd Infant School into primary schools, in Farsley. My reasons are stated below:

1. There is not enough internal or external space at Westroyd for the older KS2 children that will attend after the changes. There is no green space for PE and sports. We have also been told by the Head Teacher of Westroyd that the play equipment in the current reception playground will be removed to make space for a slightly larger hard surface for KS2 PE - this will be a huge loss for the younger children at the school. Westroyd will be the far less popular choice of school due to it being relatively inferior to the other Farsley schools in terms of space, size and facilities available. My wife has spoken to many local parents, and the majority have said they will definitely choose to send their children to Springbank Primary, with nobody wanting to send their children to Westroyd Primary, not even parents who are in favour of the proposals!
2. Creating the 1FE Westroyd Primary school will cause huge problems for children as they transition from the very small primary school, to a huge 6FE high school.
3. In the event that all 60 children chose to stay on at Westroyd during the transition years, there would physically be no room for 30 of those children to stay on. Furthermore, the transition period for children already at Westroyd will be extremely difficult, and plans for managing this have not been communicated with parents. For instance, how will parents know the size of the class they are choosing for their child, or who will potentially be in the class too? Good friendships have been built at this stage and to risk splitting up friendship groups by going to different schools will be very hard for the children to cope with. And for those children who end up being the oldest in a very small school for 5 continuous years as the school transitions, their transition to becoming the youngest in a very large secondary school will be very difficult indeed.

4. The proposals will result in more children being dropped off/picked up by car as there will be more places available for children from much further away. The changes would create 30 extra school places, but the information given out during consultation states that only 9 extra places are required in 2015, 24 places in 2016, and 13 places in 2017. This will mean children (21 in 2015, 6 in 2016, and 17 in 2017) from out of the Farsley area will have to come to Farsley schools, increasing traffic as more parents use cars to drop off and pick up their children. Particularly at the Springbank site, the huge increase in total numbers, and a larger proportion of children living further away from Farsley will add to the current horrendous traffic issues with many more cars, making the roads busier and much more dangerous for children and local residents.
5. Although the Kirklees Knoll development is in the future, if it goes ahead, it will result in a new school being built, to provide a predicted half form entry per year group. Based on the numbers given by the council, no more than a half form entry is required for the increase in child population within Farsley. Overall, this would mean there would be an excess of one whole form, if the Kirklees Knoll development goes ahead. As Westroyd would become a one form entry school, it would be the obvious choice for closure.
6. There are other options to increase Farsley school places that lead to fewer drawbacks and less negative outcomes. I do not believe that any of them have been properly and thoroughly considered as an alternative. A very good alternative was suggested during consultation to expand Springbank only. This would give 60 reception to year 2 places at Westroyd that would move to Springbank as with the current system. The additional places would be 30 new reception to year 2 places, and 30 extra year 3-6 places at Springbank. This alternative removes all of the above issues except for an increase in traffic, but money saved by having no planning or building works at the Westroyd site could be spent exploring and improving the traffic congestion problems at the schools. The transition from KS1 to KS2 would be managed effectively as it has been done for decades already. In addition it would: allow parents a choice between infant/junior or primary model; provide two points of reception entry (plus another at Farfield) within Farsley, making reception places available fairer in terms of distance to nearest school; remove the need for any building work at the Westroyd site, saving a great deal of expenditure; mean all KS2 children have ample playing and green space; mean the reception play equipment in the west playground at Westroyd could remain; make sure that Westroyd would not become a vulnerable school due to being an unpopular choice.

In addition to my objections regarding the proposals I have no trust in the figures representing the consultation responses. The consultation report states in section 3.3 that of the 75 respondents, 46% were parents and 8% residents, a total of 54% between them. That 54% equates to 41 respondents in the parents/carers/residents category on

the breakdown supplied by the council. However, this same breakdown states that there were 38 respondents in this category (14 for and 24 against). What happened to the other 3? Or were 3 extra "for" votes added onto the numbers? How many other miscounts were there in the collation of consultation responses?

I also believe the consultation process was not conducted in a fair or complete manner. Information regarding the consultation was not adequately distributed to the residents of Farsley. A huge number of parents whose children will be affected by the changes in a few years time did not know anything, meaning those important people did not have a chance to ask questions and have discussions during the process, or respond to the consultation. It would have been very easy to inform all Farsley residents, for example, by a simple leaflet to each home or an advert in the Squeaker which gets delivered to every house in Farsley, but this did not happen. Even after this was brought up during the consultation period, little was done to better inform residents and even as a parent of a child at Westroyd Nursery, I was not informed that plans were on display during recent parent meetings.

Consultation response numbers were low, supporting the fact that few people knew about the consultation. Teachers and governors made up almost half of the respondents, and taking them out of the equation gives a Farsley residents majority AGAINST the proposals. Also, we were told our consultation response should be for or against both proposals because they are linked. I completely object to any expansion of Westroyd but believe expansion may be possible at Springbank, however I object to BOTH due to them being linked. However, the council have since broken the votes down to reflect opinions about the individual schools and I suspect my response was manipulated to give a pro-Springbank vote, which it should not be.

I strongly object to the current proposals. I believe the consultation process was not conducted in a fair or proper manner as it neglected to involve the majority of Farsley residents. I also do not believe that alternative, and clearly better, proposals were given thorough or proper consideration. I urge the council to re-visit the consultation, properly consider the alternative option put forward during the previous consultation, and better advertise and involve the residents of Farsley in any further consultation process.

Yours Sincerely,

Sent: 02 May 2014 13:42
To: EDUC School Organisation
Subject: Objection to the expansion of Farsley Schools
Attachments: School notice objection_.docx

Please find my objections to the expansion of Farsley Westroyd Infant School and Farsley Springbank Junior School, attached as a word document to this email. I would appreciate an acknowledgement email so that I know my response is being considered – particularly after the technical issues with submission of our responses during the consultation process.

Kind regards,

2nd May 2014

Nigel Richardson
The Director of Children's Services
PO Box 837
Capacity, Planning and Sufficiency
Leeds City Council
LS1 9PZ

Dear Mr Richardson

I would like to present my objections to the proposals for expansion of Springbank Junior and Westroyd Infant Schools in Farsley, to become Primary schools.

I live on Springbank Close, not far from Springbank Junior School. At drop off and pick up times the traffic and parking situation on Springbank Close, Wesley Street and Springbank Road is absolutely terrible and dangerous to the children at the school as well as the residents in that area. I have also walked past Westroyd School during these times and the traffic there is much the same on New Street, Newlands and Francis Street. If these proposals go ahead, it will only add to the congestion and danger. The expansion would create 30 new school places in Farsley, but the council predict much less than this will be needed for Farsley children (according to the information provided by the council). In fact only 9 extra places are needed in 2015. This means all of the extra places would be handed out to children from surrounding areas, requiring cars to travel to/from school. The expansion itself will create nearly double the number of cars at Springbank, but a further increase traffic in traffic will result from the higher percentage of children from out of Farsley attending both schools compared to now. I went to see some of the potential building plans that were on show in October 2013. The planning officer there told me that funds may not actually stretch to some of the ideas presented. If there is little chance of funds stretching to complete the building work in the best possible way, then I doubt there will be funds for building any sort of pick up/drop off lane, or extra car park to ease the congestion caused by this expansion. The result will be gridlock on the roads surrounding the schools and will be very dangerous as drivers get stressed and children and pedestrians struggle to see properly to cross the roads.

I also do not believe there is enough space at Westroyd for the 7-11 year old children that will attend after it becomes a primary school. The school building is quite small. Although there will be no more children attending the main building than currently attend, the current children are small 4-7 year olds. But after the changes, the children will be up to 11 years old – some as large as adults!! How will everybody fit in the hall for lunch? And I do not think it is acceptable for reception children to have to cross the busy New Street twice daily to have their free school meal in the main building. There is no grass area for sports games and PE lessons for the older children. The alternate plan is remove all of the play equipment from the current reception playground to provide a larger hard surface for key stage 2 PE lessons,

but this means reception children lose out and the PE space is still not comparable to that available at the other Farsley schools. Westroyd will clearly become the unpopular choice within Farsley when parents decide between Westroyd, Springbank and Farfield, even amongst those who are in favour of the proposals. Its unpopularity, coupled with a new school being built should the Kirklees Knoll development go ahead, will leave Westroyd vulnerable to closure, leading to job losses, much upset and anguish for the children involved, and leaving no school at the South end of the village. This would again create problems for Farsley children being able to get a place at a Farsley school.

There will also be potentially huge problems for children at Westroyd when they move to secondary school. When the school is fully established, they will go from a school with 6 classes in the whole of the main school (just one class per year) at Westroyd Primary school to having at least 6 classes per year at secondary school - that's at least 30 classes in the school, not counting any sixth form classes. The change will be immense, bewildering and potentially harmful to the children. During the years of change at Westroyd the children will be even more at risk. Friendship groups will be broken as parents choose between keeping their children at Westroyd or moving them to Springbank. For those who stay on and remain the oldest in the school as the new years are formed, will go from being the oldest in a small school for 5 years, to suddenly being the youngest in a comparably very large secondary school – something I'm sure most adults would find hard to deal with, never mind children who are just approaching their teenage years. And if all parents choose to keep their children at Westroyd during the changeover years, where will 60 children be taught, when there is physically only room for 30?

At the Springbank public meeting a parent presented a very good alternate proposal that removed the majority of problems with the current proposals, where Westroyd remains unchanged and only Springbank is expanded. Springbank would gain 7 new classes, one in each year reception to year 6, giving 1 class in reception to year 2 and 3 classes in years 3 to 6. In addition, it would give parents an extra point of entry to reception class within Farsley, and provide choice between the infant/junior system and primary system of education. It would also vastly reduce costs to the expansion as a whole as Westroyd would need no changes. That money could then be spent on providing facilities at the Springbank site such as a drop off/pick up lane to vastly reduce the number of parked cars, or even a car park to remove the number of cars parked on the road side, reducing congestion and danger on the roads.

I also have issue with the consultation process. I live very close to Springbank Junior School, but only found out in October 2013 about the proposals through a family member who heard about it on Facebook! Surely we as residents in close proximity of the school, should have been notified of the potential huge changes to our area? Only 75 people have responded to the consultation process but I have signed a petition online to ask for the council to revisit the consultation. I see that petition already has 69 signatures, and I have seen other paper petitions in shops around Farsley with plenty more signatures. Surely this shows the huge number of people that had no idea about the proposals or the consultation!!

Furthermore, I do not believe the 'for' and 'against' figures that resulted from the consultation responses. In section 3.3, the consultation report says there were 75 responses, of which 46% came from parents and 8% from residents, totalling 54% between them. 54% of 75 is 41 responses, but in the parents/carers/residents category on the breakdown supplied by the council there were only 38 responses (14 for and 24 against). Did the other 3 responses vote for or against? Or are the percentage figures wrong? Were extra 'for' votes added onto the numbers? How many other errors were presented to us in consultation report?

I strongly object to the current proposals for the numerous reasons stated above. The consultation process was not fairly advertised to local residents so a large number of people have not been able to voice their concerns. I believe there are better options for expansion which the council have failed to properly consider.

Yours Sincerely,

Sent: 02 May 2014 13:40
To: EDUC School Organisation
Subject: Objection to the expansion of Farsley Schools
Attachments: School notice objection_.docx

Please find my objections to the expansion of Farsley Westroyd Infant School and Farsley Springbank Junior School, attached as a word document to this email. I would appreciate an acknowledgement email so that I know my response is being considered – particularly after the technical issues with submission of our responses during the consultation process.

Kind regards,

2nd May 2014

Nigel Richardson
The Director of Children's Services
PO Box 837
Capacity, Planning and Sufficiency
Leeds City Council
LS1 9PZ

Dear Mr Richardson

I would like to present my objections to the proposals for expansion of Springbank Junior and Westroyd Infant Schools in Farsley, to become Primary schools.

I live on Springbank Close, not far from Springbank Junior School. At drop off and pick up times the traffic and parking situation on Springbank Close, Wesley Street and Springbank Road is absolutely terrible and dangerous to the children at the school as well as the residents in that area. I have also walked past Westroyd School during these times and the traffic there is much the same on New Street, Newlands and Francis Street. If these proposals go ahead, it will only add to the congestion and danger. The expansion would create 30 new school places in Farsley, but the council predict much less than this will be needed for Farsley children (according to the information provided by the council). In fact only 9 extra places are needed in 2015. This means all of the extra places would be handed out to children from surrounding areas, requiring cars to travel to/from school. The expansion itself will create nearly double the number of cars at Springbank, but a further increase traffic in traffic will result from the higher percentage of children from out of Farsley attending both schools compared to now. I went to see some of the potential building plans that were on show in October 2013. The planning officer there told me that funds may not actually stretch to some of the ideas presented. If there is little chance of funds stretching to complete the building work in the best possible way, then I doubt there will be funds for building any sort of pick up/drop off lane, or extra car park to ease the congestion caused by this expansion. The result will be gridlock on the roads surrounding the schools and will be very dangerous as drivers get stressed and children and pedestrians struggle to see properly to cross the roads.

I also do not believe there is enough space at Westroyd for the 7-11 year old children that will attend after it becomes a primary school. The school building is quite small. Although there will be no more children attending the main building than currently attend, the current children are small 4-7 year olds. But after the changes, the children will be up to 11 years old – some as large as adults!! How will everybody fit in the hall for lunch? And I do not think it is acceptable for reception children to have to cross the busy New Street twice daily to have their free school meal in the main building. There is no grass area for sports games and PE lessons for the older children. The alternate plan is remove all of the play equipment from the current reception playground to provide a larger hard surface for key stage 2 PE lessons,

but this means reception children lose out and the PE space is still not comparable to that available at the other Farsley schools. Westroyd will clearly become the unpopular choice within Farsley when parents decide between Westroyd, Springbank and Farfield, even amongst those who are in favour of the proposals. Its unpopularity, coupled with a new school being built should the Kirklees Knoll development go ahead, will leave Westroyd vulnerable to closure, leading to job losses, much upset and anguish for the children involved, and leaving no school at the South end of the village. This would again create problems for Farsley children being able to get a place at a Farsley school.

There will also be potentially huge problems for children at Westroyd when they move to secondary school. When the school is fully established, they will go from a school with 6 classes in the whole of the main school (just one class per year) at Westroyd Primary school to having at least 6 classes per year at secondary school - that's at least 30 classes in the school, not counting any sixth form classes. The change will be immense, bewildering and potentially harmful to the children. During the years of change at Westroyd the children will be even more at risk. Friendship groups will be broken as parents choose between keeping their children at Westroyd or moving them to Springbank. For those who stay on and remain the oldest in the school as the new years are formed, will go from being the oldest in a small school for 5 years, to suddenly being the youngest in a comparably very large secondary school – something I'm sure most adults would find hard to deal with, never mind children who are just approaching their teenage years. And if all parents choose to keep their children at Westroyd during the changeover years, where will 60 children be taught, when there is physically only room for 30?

At the Springbank public meeting a parent presented a very good alternate proposal that removed the majority of problems with the current proposals, where Westroyd remains unchanged and only Springbank is expanded. Springbank would gain 7 new classes, one in each year reception to year 6, giving 1 class in reception to year 2 and 3 classes in years 3 to 6. In addition, it would give parents an extra point of entry to reception class within Farsley, and provide choice between the infant/junior system and primary system of education. It would also vastly reduce costs to the expansion as a whole as Westroyd would need no changes. That money could then be spent on providing facilities at the Springbank site such as a drop off/pick up lane to vastly reduce the number of parked cars, or even a car park to remove the number of cars parked on the road side, reducing congestion and danger on the roads.

I also have issue with the consultation process. I live very close to Springbank Junior School, but only found out in October 2013 about the proposals through a family member who heard about it on Facebook! Surely we as residents in close proximity of the school, should have been notified of the potential huge changes to our area? Only 75 people have responded to the consultation process but I have signed a petition online to ask for the council to revisit the consultation. I see that petition already has 69 signatures, and I have seen other paper petitions in shops around Farsley with plenty more signatures. Surely this shows the huge number of people that had no idea about the proposals or the consultation!!

Furthermore, I do not believe the 'for' and 'against' figures that resulted from the consultation responses. In section 3.3, the consultation report says there were 75 responses, of which 46% came from parents and 8% from residents, totalling 54% between them. 54% of 75 is 41 responses, but in the parents/carers/residents category on the breakdown supplied by the council there were only 38 responses (14 for and 24 against). Did the other 3 responses vote for or against? Or are the percentage figures wrong? Were extra 'for' votes added onto the numbers? How many other errors were presented to us in consultation report?

I strongly object to the current proposals for the numerous reasons stated above. The consultation process was not fairly advertised to local residents so a large number of people have not been able to voice their concerns. I believe there are better options for expansion which the council have failed to properly consider.

Yours Sincerely,

Sent: 07 May 2014 13:10
To: EDUC School Organisation
Subject: Farsley school objection

3rd May 2014

The director of Children's Services
[PO Box 837](#)
[Capacity, Planning & Sufficiency](#)
[Leeds City Council](#)
[LS1 9PZ](#)

Dear Sir/Madam,

I am writing to raise an objection to the expansion plans for Farsley Westroyd Infant School and Farsley Springbank Junior School. The plans are to turn both Schools into standalone Primary Schools. I feel that the plans haven't been thought out properly and continually throughout the consultation process genuine concerns and better plans have not been looked into thoroughly. The expansion will see a problem currently experienced at the bottom of Farsley where children do not get into their school of choice lifted and shifted to the top end of Farsley because the majority of parents do not want to send their children to Westroyd, with Springbank being by far the more favourite option. I have a large list of objections to the current plans and wish to object by listing the main issues of your plans below.

Objection 1 - Lack of outdoor space - Westroyd

Westroyd School does not have enough outdoor space to deal with pupils who are older (7-11) and need and want a grassed area to let off steam at play times and play grassed based Sports such as Football. The plans to potentially allow sports off site is not practical, it would also have a cost involved, either to send children by mini bus/ pay the location. Schools do send children to swimming lessons at Leisure centres because as a general rule local authority schools do not have this facility onsite so all children would go offsite in this example. Our village and the surrounding primaries have all had ample space outdoors and children at Westroyd have been able to move to Springbank in year 3 to have the opportunity of a playing field, if these plans go ahead it will disadvantage many children attending Westroyd. It has also been discussed that the sports could take place on local parks. Physical Education on a park is not safe, nor is it practical therefore shouldn't be considered.

Objection 2 - Kirklees Knoll = Westroyd vulnerability.

It has been stated that the plans for expansion are for a shortage of school places for Sept 2015 and cannot be based on possible housing that might be built on Kirklees Knoll. I am aware of a section 106 within the plans for Kirklees Knoll that means should the building go ahead then the builders will have to provide a School. If this does happen then it will leave Westroyd very vulnerable to closure and no school at the top end of Farsley. As both a resident and parent this worries me immensely. Parents at the top end of Farsley are set to lose in your plans one way or another, either by having an unpopular Primary School or no school at all.

Objection 3 - other schools more suitable for expansion haven't been investigated.

Currently children at the bottom of Farsley that have Valley View as their nearest school are applying for places at Westroyd. Serious consideration should have been given to expanding Valley view, a school that does have the space to expand unlike Westroyd. I have not seen and it has not been discussed that this has ever been investigated in any depth. It would mean that there would be no requirement to expand Westroyd and if the plans for Kirklees knoll do go ahead then the children at the bottom of Farsley will get a new

school longer term. There is also another good school in Farsley, Farfield - expanding this school also seems like a much more feasible option.

Objection 4 - Better counter proposal briefly discussed but not given serious consideration.

Another parent put forward a proposal to keep Westroyd as an infant school but change Springbank to a single form Primary so that 30 children would join SB reception in 2015 and 60 children would continue to start reception at WR and then feed in at year 3. The only reason I have been advised about there being an issue here is that children are disadvantaged at a split school and the children starting at Springbank would have an advantage over children who move in year 3. I completely disagree with this. This has been the set up within Farsley for decades and has still been an extremely popular school choice within the community. To say at this point that children would be disadvantaged seems a flawed argument. In relation to children having an unfair advantage if they have the 4-11 education at SB, I disagree with this statement. I think the disadvantage that could possibly be seen here, is far less of a disadvantage to what would be experienced sending a key stage 2 child to Westroyd. I actually think this theory is much more workable to families, although teachers don't seem to be as onside with this again the only negative I've heard is that moving from KS1 to KS2 is not good for child development. I'd strongly disagree with this based on the fact that this has happened successfully in Farsley for decades. If I was yet to have children, I would as a first choice opt for Westroyd until year 2 and then transfer to Springbank. Westroyd is a brilliant school but for early years provisions and KS1 children, due to its space constraints.

Objection 5 - Objections received at consultation.

The figures received from the objections to the proposals show in black and white that the majority of parents are against Westroyd expansion, yet we haven't been listened to. A number of parents feel that they were not allowed to have a voice at the consultation meetings and too much time was given to teachers, governors and teachers from other schools. If the majority of parents objected to WR expansion this should show how unpopular this school will be as a Primary if the expansion goes ahead.

Objection 6 - Parking issues

Both schools already have parking issues, but to increase numbers so drastically at SB will cause further traffic issues in the area. The area at the end of Springbank Close is already a safety concern for local residents and the fact that Farsley does not actually need the number of school places it is providing as it only needs 9, this will mean that families travel from further afield such as Rodley which will add to traffic congestion and the chance of a child getting hurt when people aren't paying attention fighting for spaces at the end of the school day.

Objection 7 - LCC have failed to inform the community about the expansion.

Although parents of children at these schools have been informed about expansion, they are not as affected. Families with children who are below school age or people who are pregnant are the people that will be most affected by any changes, yet they have not been given any opportunity to be made aware of these changes and therefore have not had a choice to raise objection. A petition (which will be sent separately) shows that people are unhappy with the expansion plan. I would like to add that I am also pregnant and had I not had a child at this school then I would not have known anything about this. I feel that this has been done intentionally to stop getting a lot of negative views from the people who are affected the most.

In summary, I object to the expansion at both Westroyd and Springbank and think a lot more could have been done to improve the plans that were moved forward to this stage and there are 2 other better solutions which must be seriously investigated objection 3&4. LCC must do more to support the children of the Farsley community to create a better school expansion plan to ensure that Westroyd continues as an Infant school.

Kind Regards

Sent: 06 May 2014 21:44
To: EDUC School Organisation
Subject: Objection to Farsley schools expansion
Attachments: School notice objection .docx

Dear Sir,

Please find attached a word document, outlining my objections to the expansion of the Farlsey schools, Springbank Junior and Westroyd Infants, to primary schools. A response would be much appreciated so that I can be sure my views are being considered, particularly after the issues with online submission of objections during the consultation period.

Kind regards,

6th May 2014

Nigel Richardson
The Director of Children's Services
PO Box 837
Capacity, Planning and Sufficiency
Leeds City Council
LS1 9PZ

Dear Mr Richardson

I strongly object to the current linked proposals to expand Springbank Junior and Westroyd Infant schools into primary schools. The expansion plans will leave Westroyd as an unpopular, and much less equipped school relative to the other 2 (Springbank and Farfield) primary schools that would be available in Farsley. As a primary school, Westroyd would be inferior to the other Farsley primary schools in terms of space and facilities. It would become a vulnerable school due to its unpopularity and would be extremely vulnerable to closure as a 1FE school should the Kirklees Knoll development go ahead as another school would be built there as part of the S106 agreement. Traffic would become much worse at drop off and pick up times, particularly at the Springbank site, making the roads much more dangerous for our children and the local residents. Other options have not been properly or seriously considered, such as the counter-proposal outlined below, as well as the option of expanding either Farfield Primary or Valley View Primary Schools to 3FE schools, as they both have large areas of land for expansion. My statements of objection are written in more detail below as counter responses to those written on the consultation report:

The positive comments received during the consultation, shown in section 3.5 of the consultation report, are summarised in the following points 1-5, immediately followed by the reasons why these are not actually positive points, because they are either wrong or also have negative issues associated:

1. *"These changes would create local school places for local children. This should also reduce the need for people using their cars to travel to drop their children off at school."*
 - In 2015, there are only 9 extra places required according to the information given out during consultation, but 30 extra places will be created. This will allow 21 children from much further afield (out of Farsley) to come to the very popular Farsley schools. This will in fact increase the need for people using cars to drop off and pick up their children and make the already bad traffic situation much worse and more dangerous for the children and residents.

2. *“Creating a 1FE primary school at Farsley Westroyd Infant School will return it to being a village school where the staff will know all the children’s names.”*
 - Creating a 1FE primary school will cause big transition problems for children when moving from a tiny 1FE primary school, up to a huge 5 or 6FE high school.

3. *“Having 2 primary schools (1FE and 2 FE) would be better in Farsley than a 3FE infant and junior school model. Creating two primary schools will create better staff development opportunities.”*
 - Staff development opportunities should be available whether infant, junior or primary schools and if they are not, then that is the failing of the school and local authority. The current staff chose to apply to, and work at, the infant or junior schools over the huge number of primary schools in Leeds, so clearly there are advantages to working in infant or junior schools over primary schools for these teachers.

4. *“Creating two primary schools will create consistency for the children and remove transition issues between KS1 and KS2. Siblings will be at the same school and will reduce costs for parents as they will only have to buy one uniform.”*
 - There are no issues of transition between KS1 and KS2 under the current system that are not managed by communication between the two schools and good teaching practice. This has been the case for decades! There will be no reduction in cost for parents regarding uniform purchases because children of this age range require a new uniform each year (at least) as they are in a period of physical growth and development.

5. *“Farsley Westroyd Infant School may be a small site however there is confidence in the management team that it will be managed well and they will ensure the best outcome for the children.”*
 - The best outcome for children would be to have a larger school, a similar amount of green space as the other Farsley schools for PE and sports, and enough playground space to allow the play equipment currently in the west playground to remain. However, this is not possible because there is nowhere for this school site to expand.

Many issues and concerns were also raised throughout the consultation period. The consultation report responded to some of these in section 3.6, but I feel those responses were either inadequate or flawed as outlined below:

1. **“Concern:** *There is not enough internal or external space at Farsley Westroyd Infant School for the number of extra children expected.*
Response: *It is recognised that the Westroyd site is relatively small, however it is of a similar size to other successful 1FE primary schools in Leeds and the overall site and buildings are within the range recommended within national guidance. The school are a key member of the design team and are supportive of a proposed solution that requires only minor extension to the main school building, with no loss of play space or car parking. As the need is for 1 additional classroom, it has been agreed that there is a clear educational benefit to this being provided as an extension to the existing nursery building to create a Foundation unit. This will also*

allow the external space on the nursery site to be developed further. It is acknowledged that the site is not large and there would not be external green space on the school site for on-site PE. However, there would be suitable indoor and hard play areas, and access could be arranged for off-site provision in the same way that, for example, swimming lessons are currently provided off-site for primary schools. Schools are used to managing the safe transportation of children and this would not be a safeguarding concern.”

- The response basically states that the Westroyd site would be in a ‘make do’ situation with the facilities available, rather than a best practice option. It is difficult to see how this is beneficial to children. The school may fit within recommended national guidance, but it will be less popular due to it being comparatively inferior to the other Farsley schools in terms of facilities available. Furthermore, the response states that there will be no loss of play space, but we have already been told by the Head Teacher of Westroyd that the play equipment in the west playground will be removed, which will be a huge detriment to the younger children.

2. **“Concern:** *Concerns around transition between Farsley Westroyd Infant School and Farsley Springbank Junior School during the changes, particularly with regard to sibling priorities.*

Response: *The transition arrangements would allow for 60 year 3 places at Springbank for three years to enable those who wished to transfer to Springbank as they had intended on entering Westroyd to do so. Children in Westroyd would automatically be entitled to stay on and complete their primary education there. This would allow for maximum parental choice. As a part of this statutory process we can describe the transition arrangements that will apply for the schools, and this overwrites the admissions policy for its duration. The proposed transition arrangements allow sibling priorities to be applied to both older and younger siblings. No admissions arrangements can ever provide an absolute guarantee of places, but these will ensure in practical terms that the children attending Westroyd will have priority for the Springbank places. Full details of the commitments are in appendix 1.”*

- In the event that all 60 children chose to stay on at Westroyd during the transition years (unlikely given the school’s inferior status, but possible), there would physically be no room for 30 of those children to stay on. Furthermore, the transition period for children already at Westroyd will be extremely difficult, and plans for managing this have not been communicated with parents. For instance, how will parents know the context of the class they are choosing for their child? (i.e. what size will the class be? Which children will be in the class? If the numbers are small, will classes of different year groups be lumped together into one?) Good friendships have been built at this stage and to risk splitting up friendship groups by going to different schools could be very hard for the children to cope with. And for those children who end up being the eldest in a very small school for 5 continuous years as the school transitions, their transition to becoming the youngest in a very large secondary school will be very difficult indeed.

3. **“Concern:** *The changes will make Farsley Westroyd Infant School vulnerable as parents will choose Farsley Springbank Junior School due to better facilities and more space.*

Response: *The evidence in previous infant and junior conversions is that some parents prefer to stay at the former infant school. In part, this will be influenced by their location and family situation. Ultimately, the school believe that their future as a full primary school, able to offer a wider range of extra-curricular and main curriculum activities, and to attract and retain a wider range of staff and offer a broader range of staff career opportunities will make the school more secure.”*

- I have spoken to many local parents, and the majority have said they will definitely choose to send their children to Springbank Primary. I am yet to find anybody that would definitely send their children to Westroyd Primary. Even a couple of parents who told me they were in favour of the proposals, also said they would not choose Westroyd Primary for their children. Clearly Westroyd would be an unpopular choice no matter whether you are for against expansion!

4. **“Concern:** *Parking and traffic is already an issue at both schools, these expansions will only make it worse.*

Response: *Children’s Services have commenced engagement with officers within the relevant parts of the Highways department with the aim of ensuring that the impact on the surrounding road and footpath infrastructure is minimised in so far as this is possible. Options being considered at this stage are extended opening times; staggered pick up and drop off times; walking buses, and options for parents to park further away from the school and walk. Child safety is a key priority and we would try to ensure that staff cars are off the road. These proposals may reduce the number of car journeys between the two schools. It is our policy to encourage children to walk to school. If we do need to use play space for parking, then it would be re-provided elsewhere. As Springbank becomes a new primary school there are expected to be fewer car journeys by parents who have children on both sites; and children who live closer to the Springbank site will not need to travel to the Westroyd site to a KS1 school place.”*

- The proposals will result in more children being dropped off/picked up by car as there will be more places available for children from much further away. For instance in 2015, only 9 extra places are needed but 30 will be created, making 21 places for children from further away. Particularly at the Springbank site, the huge increase in total numbers, and a larger proportion of children living further away from Farsley will add to the current horrendous traffic issues with many more cars, making the roads busier and much more dangerous for children and local residents.

8. **“Counter proposal:** *Consider keeping the infant school unchanged, and change Springbank into a primary school with 30 reception places, and also keep admitting an extra 60 children into year 3 for the Westroyd children to join.*

Response: *The counter proposal addresses many of the concerns about this proposal and offers other options. It would require one further class base at the junior site in addition to the accommodation required for the two form entry primary school model proposed. It would create the extra 30 places, whilst*

retaining the option of an infant and junior as well as primary school options. It would increase access to Farsley schools for Farsley residents because a new admission point for reception would still be created at Springbank. It would ensure all KS2 children had outdoor playing field provision on site at the school. However, on balance it is not the preferred option. Perhaps most importantly from an educational perspective it does not remove the risks of transition associated with infant and junior schools, instead it makes them more complex, risking the outcomes for children. It would mean that the benefits of consistency and continuity of care which the original proposal offers are lost, and that the transition risks remain for the majority of pupils. The schools would lose the benefits of becoming primary schools; that is the opportunity to attract and retain staff and offer greater breadth and depth of professional experience. This in turn would impact on the opportunities that the children had."

- There are so many benefits to this counter-proposal over the current proposal as stated in the above response, and I do not believe that it has been properly and thoroughly considered as an alternative.
- There is little research into the transition effects of infant/junior schooling as opposed to primary schooling, and any value added to the primary system is less for children going through the proposed changes. There is no evidence to suggest that there is currently an issue regarding the transition between Westroyd and Springbank – for instance how do the KS2 children compare between Springbank Junior and Farfield Primary? The evidence is not there. There is no risk between KS1 and KS2 that cannot be properly managed by the two schools working closely together (as they do now) in this counter-proposal. The infant/junior system has worked well for decades without children being ‘at risk’ because the schools have been very good at managing that transition. It is clearly a popular choice of schooling model with parents too, given the competition for places at these schools, even from families that do not live in Farsley. It would also be easy to add a link between the schools for the admissions policy to ensure children at Westroyd were prioritised for a place at Springbank during the KS1-KS2 transition. The main benefit to having two primary schools seems to be for staff development, but as I stated above, staff development should be available whether the school is an infant, junior or primary model, and this is the responsibility of the schools and local authority.
- The counter-proposal allows parents a choice between infant/junior or primary model. It provides two points of reception entry (plus another at Farfield) within Farsley, making reception places available fairer in terms of distance to nearest school. There would be no need for any building work at the Westroyd site, saving a great deal of expenditure on planning and actual building works – money that could be spent on the Springbank expansion to tackle traffic issues for instance. It would mean all KS2 children have ample playing and green space, and would mean the reception play equipment in the west playground at Westroyd could remain. It would also mean that Westroyd would not become a vulnerable school due to being an unpopular choice.

9. **“Concern:** *The potential housing at Kirklees Knoll will necessitate a new school anyway, and that should be pursued instead.*

Response: *The proposal is brought forward on the basis of the children who are already living in the area. Should the Kirklees Knoll project go forward this will produce further demand, estimated at half a form of entry across every year group. A S106 agreement has been drawn up with the developer that would contribute to a new school being provided on the site if the development went ahead. However the timing of this means that it could not be brought forward soon enough to meet the needs of the children already in the area. Meeting those needs in a timely manner forms an essential part of our drive to become a child friendly city, and meet our obsessions. At this stage, securing the land for a new school is an essential precaution, however there remains a significant funding gap, not least to acquire the land for the school, and all options will be evaluated if the building proposals are approved. The impact on neighbouring schools and their ability to expand would also be taken into consideration.”*

- If the Kirklees Knoll development goes ahead and a new school is built, only a half form entry is required per year. Based on the numbers given by the council, approximately half a form entry is required for the increase in child population within Farsley. Overall, this would mean there would be an excess of one whole form. As Westroyd would become a one form entry school, it would then become extremely vulnerable to closure.

Additionally, the numbers of for and against responses cannot be trusted as the numbers in the report did not add up. The consultation report states in section 3.3 that of the 75 respondents, 46% were parents and 8% residents, a total of 54% between them, which equates to at least 41 respondents in the parents/carers/residents category on the breakdown supplied by the council. However, this same breakdown states that there were only 38 in this category (14 for and 24 against), so what happened to the other 3 votes? Or were 3 extra “for” votes added onto the numbers? How many other miscounts were there in the collation of consultation responses?

As well as opposing the proposals, I also believe the consultation process was not adequate to distribute information to the residents of Farsley and the parents whose children will be affected by the changes, meaning those important people did not have a say, or chance to ask questions and have discussions during the process, or respond to the consultation.

The notice document is quite clear that it did not distribute the information to ALL of the general public of Farsley. This could have been done in many ways – including a leaflet drop to each home, large notices in local shops, an advert in the Squeaker (which is delivered to every house in Farsley), to name a few – but instead efforts were focussed on giving information to parents whose children already attend the schools (and are therefore mostly unaffected), governors and teachers. I myself have a

daughter at Westroyd nursery, but only found out through social media – information from the school came much later. And in fact when up to date drawings of structural plans were on display during parents meetings recently, I did not get chance to see them because my meeting was scheduled at the nursery site and nobody directed me to the plans at the main school. Again, no information was available.

Looking at the figures of those who responded during consultation, it is clear that the residents of Farsley did not know about it, due to their very small numbers. In fact, teachers and governors made up almost half of the respondents which seems wholly biased. Taking them out of the equation actually gives a majority AGAINST the proposals. I also wonder how the council have broken down the figures into for and against for each school? We were told quite clearly during consultation that we had to vote for both or against both because they are linked proposals. I am completely against any expansion of Westroyd but believe it might be possible at Springbank, however I am against BOTH due to them being linked. But I suspect my response was manipulated to give a pro-Springbank vote.

I believe the consultation process was not conducted in a fair or proper manner as it neglected to involve the majority of Farsley residents. I also do not believe that alternative, and clearly better, proposals were given thorough consideration. I urge the council to re-visit the consultation, properly consider the alternative option put forward during the previous consultation, and better advertise and involve the residents of Farsley in any further consultation process.

Yours sincerely,

Sent: 06 May 2014 11:31
To: EDUC School Organisation
Subject: Response to statutory notice about school expansions- Farsley

I would like to raise the following issues against the proposals in Farsley:

1. Most people who live in Farsley only know about the plans because of work conducted by those who live here. LCC have done little to let people know about their intentions. Quite the opposite, a lot of the information gathered by the community has been routinely acquired through freedom of information requests. Hardly, an open consultation process encouraging trust, especially when so many mistakes have been made...
2. The consultation process was inadequate. Wrong or conflicting information highlighted continually by the parents (especially in the consultation document), badly conducted and arrogant meetings with no design plans provided, and critically the online response form / filing system didn't actually work. The council sited an issue with adobe acrobat, a system not universally used and clearly this was just a smokescreen to cover up a major mistake. I only found out that my response had not got through by chance. How many others went missing?! Was this failure present in consultation processes elsewhere? This has to be examined by an independent body to ensure the consultation has been robust, diplomatic and fair. The council can not possibly quantify this loss of data or underestimate the importance of these missed responses. Attempts to quickly extend the consultation deadline once we highlighted the system failure were already heavily compromised as many people remained unaware of the issue and did not resend a response and those aware either didn't have the time or heart to repeat a lengthy typed response to a council seemingly unwilling to consider the opposition anyhow...
3. 65% of parents are against the Westroyd proposals according to your eventual consultation findings. Was this diplomatic, consultation process going to acknowledge this clear majority against or arrogantly carry on regardless? True to form the council seemed to think they know best or was it simply that ideas and adaptability are in short supply on the expansion team?
4. There is no plan B. No other options have been properly considered. What about the two schools, Valley View and Farfield with loads of space expanding to three form? Granted those families desperate to get into Westroyd from the bottom of Farsley and Rodley are reticent to send their children to their nearest school, Valley View based on old perceptions. Much has been done to improve Valley View recently and with minimal reinvestment (compared to expansion plans) and some publicity on the councils part this perception could so easily be changed. I have to ask at this point whether the presence of one of the council's expansion plan team being until very recently on the board of governors at Westroyd represented a conflict of interest or at the very least a biased influence going into the consultation process? When questioned on this the council refused to clear this up, adding to speculation and pressure on the individual and their family. A freedom of information request followed as did the standing down of that governor from Westroyd. This all could have been so easily avoided, if better communication had been shown by the council. A member of the expansion team on the governors board could and should have been a positive conduit to discussions. Why the secrecy?
5. I still don't feel there have been answers to the questions about how the lack of space at Westroyd will be worked around, or the traffic issues at Springbank. Many of the people living around Springbank were questioned recently and many were unaware of the plans either. Maybe those tiny A4 sheets tied to lamp posts aren't the most effective or transparent of communication platforms afterall.

6. What will happen if the planned Kirklees Knoll expansion happens and a new school is built in two years time? I know the two issues are being kept separate but surely if we're talking about public money and the overall education remit and solution within the area, they shouldn't be. Rumours continue that contractors are in place for that development and a new school is part of the plans...maybe time for another FOI request.

7. I'm still not sure that LCC have demonstrated the need for 30 extra places have they? And what will happen if there is a decline in the birth rate again like ten years ago. Will this be another Rodley, with Westroyd school being conveniently shut and sold to make flats and further help massage the councils high new build figures?

8. I haven't been given any information about how this will effect my child during the transition. What happens if my son stays at Westroyd and he is the oldest year for four years? How will this effect his transition to secondary school. How will we know what type of class he will be in at either school? How will the disruption to his peer group effect him? All well researched stuff, but none of it used to help parents understand what it will mean for their child. Ultimately, so far you've only asked parents what they think, but you haven't actually helped parents understand what it will mean for their children.

9. Last, but not least will the council listen or acknowledge any responses or clear majorities regarding the effectiveness of the consultation or the ill judged expansion plan itself this time? Surely anyone can see that a short term and expensive, crisis management solution will only further complicate the eventual education provision in Farsley. The same council team will then have to begin again, when a rethink now even if only temporarily to re-examine other solutions will at the very least vastly alter the perception of the council team locally and may even help find a solution that the majority of the community and the council agree is workable and sensible. Not only, inlight of current shortfalls, but with an overarching consideration of longer term impacts and changes to the areas population and educational provision (Government permitting). Or, do the council ultimately believe they know best? Keep quiet now, you've had your legal say, let us get on so we can take our blinkered, poorly communicated and undemocratic caravan of incompetence to the next unfortunate community...just my present personal opinion you understand, I await hopefully to be proven wrong!

Sent: 05 May 2014 21:30
To: EDUC School Organisation
Subject: Response to statutory notice about school expansions- Farsley

I would like to voice the following concerns about the proposals:

1. A lack of considered consultation with the community has meant that a fraction of people know about the plans and had a chance to comment. The community have frequently asked to help organise local meetings, distribute flyers made by the council, put up posters made by the council etc. and each time have been ignored. In addition, plans have been made available to some people and not others, parents with children about to start nursery at Westroyd next year are unaware and very upset that they have not been included, and there seems to be a general misunderstanding about what a public consultation should be.
2. The paper based consultation information and meetings held by LCC were full of factual errors and biased information. For example, issues concerning transition had not even been considered asking serious question of the pre-planning process before it even reached the general public and numbers were wrong in terms of which year children would transfer to different schools. In addition, one of the consultation meetings featured a head-teacher from another school who was consistently allowed to voice her strong feelings in favour of the proposals, when parents were asked to be quiet - several parents walked out as a result.
3. Even the responses which were given through the consultation phases were ignored. 65% of parents were against the plans for Westroyd School to expand and yet was still taken forward to statutory notice.
4. Alternative suggestions and solutions were not considered or discussed. The opportunity to expand the large site schools of Valley View and Farfield which would support all of the catchment area of Farsley were not even considered. This seems to be more because of an inability to raise the profile of the very good Valley View School than because it makes more sense to expand the tiny Westroyd site. In addition, the opportunity to link the two schools so that intake at Westoryd in reception is based on home to school distance at either school has failed to be even considered. This would solve the problem with parents at the bottom end of Farlsey not feeling they are able to go to a Farsley school, and would ensure that that the issue that currently happens, isn't just transferred to the top end of the village with Westoryd having just 30 places.
5. How the LCC team has dealt with the Farsley community in comparison with other areas such as Guiseley and Horsforth has shown inconsistency in approach.
6. The responses to questions put forward at the consultation meetings and through the consultation process have not been answered. Especially with regard to how the lack of outside space will be accommodated at Westroyd and how traffic issues will be managed at Springbank.
7. The lack of forward planning with regard to potential housing developments and new schools in the next couple of years demonstrates a shocking disregard for the best use public finances.
8. Raw data demonstrating the need for new school places is based on unreliable evidence. To date, no-one at LCC or the government departments including the ONS are able to explain what is meant by the area "Farsley". Therefore, it is impossible to base an accurate calculation of school place numbers needed.

9. School transition issues have not been addressed. Children currently in year 1 staying at Westoryd would be the oldest children in school from the end of year 2 until high school - how will this affect these children?

10. Equally, the transition problems concerned with KS1 to 2 seem to be being overplayed to ensure the expansions go ahead. There is a small body of evidence that suggests value added is slightly smaller at the end of KS2 as a result of transition from infant to junior, but actual outcomes are not effected. In terms of Springbank and Westroyd, the transition is successfully managed and therefore is a non-argument in making the school primary school when there are other options available, such as expanding other local schools with adequate space.

I can't help but feel that this is a cobbled together plan that does little to address the real needs of the children and the village. If the opportunity to expand Farfield or Valley View had been looked at but not possible, then I could more understand why this had been put forward, given the limitations currently placed on councils by the legislation from Michael Gove. As it is, it's difficult to see why this is the best option. In addition, the lack of regard for the community in terms of consultation has really opened my eyes to how local government consider those they work for. I really thought that this was not a "done deal" as one of your team kept saying, and that LCC actually would listen to concerns and comments. But all the evidence suggests that this was set in stone way before the first inkling of the plans hit the press last July. A real kick in the face for democracy.

Many thanks

Sent: 07 May 2014 11:33
To: EDUC School Organisation
Subject: School expansion Farsley Westroyd/Springbank

To whom this may concern.

I am writing to advise that I do not support the expansions of Westroyd Infants and Springbank Junior schools for the following reasons:-

1. Due to there being no pre-consultation period only one proposal for the school expansions was put forward by the council. When asked why the option to change Springbank to a primary school whilst keeping Westroyd as an infant feeder school was not there, the reply was 'it didn't get a very positive response when we suggested at another school'. This was after we were informed the council team had worked on many different school expansions and that they are all different and unique in their needs and requirements. A better more popular proposal was put on the table by the parents, which was significantly more popular yet this was dismissed as challenging and at the detriment to the pupils. Farsley Westroyd and Springbank have been a split school for many years. Until now there has been absolutely no issue from parents/teachers. It is unfair for teachers/council to suddenly be against this
2. The proposal that was put forward has a very positive bias towards the expansion, and fails to highlight and inform people of the possible disadvantages / negatives of a school expansion. How could parents make a decision based on a one sided view?
3. There is no information or clarification of where the boundaries lie for village of Farsley, which discredits the data used to measure / determine how many school places are needed. Birth data for 2015 indicates a peak in birth rates but what happens when the birth rates potentially lower in future years and then an influx of children out of Farsley then get into the school causing problems for Farsley children again.
4. The moving of the school catchment area to include Kirklees Knoll, (not Kirklees Knowl as stated in numerous pieces of council produced documents), will create the same issue further down the line should the development of 468 houses go ahead on this land. The reason this problem will arise is because as we have been informed this possible development has not been taken in to account when calculating the figures for how many school places are required. The section 106 clause in any building to be undertaken on Kirklees Knoll would mean that a new School could be built, thus potentially meaning Farsley Westroyd would be at risk of closure.
5. Not all surrounding schools, (especially those affected by the possible change in the school catchment area boundaries), have been informed about the proposal. This point was raised by the Head of Governors of a nearby school (Valley View) who was attending a consultation meeting as a local resident. In addition to this there is more space to expand Valley View or Farsley Farfield compared to Farsley Westroyd. Which would be less disruptive than turning Westroyd into a Primary School.
6. There have been no plans to show how the increase in vehicles and traffic flow will be managed for either school. This is a massive concern when you take in to account the current state of high vehicle volume and poor management that occurs now, before you add the additional numbers the expansions will bring especially near to Springbank School.

7 . No information has been distributed to local residents, or to the parents of 0-3 year old, for whom this is a major decision that will affect them and their children.

8 . There has been a lack of information in general, and the information that has been distributed / communicated has been done so very poorly. Numerous times my child has brought a letter home from nursery that refers to events that have passed.

9 . Throughout the full consultation process we were repeatedly informed that the council and teachers will make this expansion work, but at no point have they provided any reassurance by being unable to answer questions or provide solutions of how they will manage issues such as where outdoor P.E lessons will take place at Westroyd, how they will manage segregation of different year groups and how they will cope with the distinct lack of space in general at Westroyd.

10 . I have major concerns that the Westroyd site is not big enough to meet the recommendations set in Building Bulletin 99. Why should children who go to Westroyd if it were a Primary School have to do PE lessons offsite. This is not common in LS28 (I don't think there is any other school where there is no grassed areas for Sports. To take this away from Families within Farsley at such short notice with such a short plan of action that is not a permanent solution is unfair and unjust, when there are other schools locally that can accommodate an expansion and remain a Primary School. Farsley parents do not want this and the objections to your proposal last time clearly show this. Do the opinions of the people that are requiring school places actually matter?

11 . I have been highly unimpressed with the use of the word 'will' during the consultation meetings. Surely the word 'would' should be used instead. That is if the decision for the expansions hasn't already been made , along with what seems like a distinct lack of willingness from LCC to inform residents and the people who are going to be affected the most, to generate fewer objections.

12 . Finally I am not completely confident that the full process has been carried out with the transparency that it should in a timely manner, so to enable parents and residents to make an informed decision.

I urge the Council to re consider the current plans to at least investigate a) Keeping Westroyd as an Infant School and Turning Springbank into a primary by speaking to Parents (not Staff) to actually make the right decision for Farsley residents and the future of our village. B) Look into expanding Valley View /Farfield Primary Schools.

Review the petition (to be sent by post) document to understand the decisions you are taking are so unpopular with many parents and residents alike.

Yours Sincerely